1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
0	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	
2	Alexandria Division	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
1	Plaintiff	: No. 1:22-cr-00122-RDA-1
4	v.	·
5	<b>v</b> .	· :
	JULIO R. SOTOMAYOR,	:
6	·	: August 30, 2023
	Defendant	: 11:15 a.m.
7		: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :
8		F SENTENCING HEARING
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROSSIE D. ALSTON, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
10	APPEARANCES:	
11	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	
12		HEIDI B. GESCH UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
13		EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 2100 Jamieson Avenue
14		Alexandria, VA 22314 703-299-3700
T-1		703-299-3700
15	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	JOHN J. PEASE, III MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
16		1701 Market Street
17		Philadelphia, PA 19103 215-963-5000
18		JONATHAN P. YORK MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
19		1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
20		Washington, DC 20004 202-739-5119
21	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:	REBECCA STONESTREET, RPR, CRR
22	OFFICIAL COOK! REPORTER:	U.S. District Court, 9th Floor 401 Courthouse Square
23		Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (240) 426-7767
24		
25	( pages 1 - 57)	
	COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES	

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 COURTROOM CLERK: Criminal number 2022-122, 3 United States of America versus Julio Sotomayor. Counsel, please note your appearances for the record. 4 5 MR. SULLIVAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 6 Edward Sullivan and Heidi Gesch for the United States. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. 8 MR. PEASE: Good morning, Your Honor. John Pease and 9 Jonathan York on behalf of the defendant, Mr. Sotomayor. 10 THE COURT: Good morning. Mr. Sotomayor is also 11 This matter comes on today for a sentencing. Are 12 there any corrections, deletions, or modifications to the presentence report prepared in the matter? I know that there 13 14 are some issues that we need to resolve as far as the 15 calculation of the guidelines and the like. But as far as the 16 substance of the presentence report, are there any corrections, 17 deletions, or modifications? 18 MR. PEASE: No, nothing beyond the objections you're 19 aware of, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Is there any evidence that the government 21 wants to present? 22 MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Any evidence from the defendant? MR. PEASE: Your Honor, I would like to have the 24 25 opportunity for the defendant's wife and son to say a few words

```
1
      to the Court.
 2
               THE COURT: Sure. Is the government fine with them
 3
      being able to do this without the benefit of cross-examination,
      or would you like the opportunity to cross-examine?
 4
 5
               MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, we just learned about this.
 6
      So if it is going to be character-related information, then we
 7
      don't need cross-examination. If it's going to be substantive,
 8
      then we may like to reserve our opportunity to cross-examine.
 9
               THE COURT: We'll do that with reservation. Why don't
10
      we go ahead and do this. Why don't we call him to the stand,
11
      and I'll let him be sworn.
12
               MR. PEASE: The defendant would call
      Carlos Ibarra.
13
14
                (Oath administered by courtroom deputy clerk.)
15
        (CARLOS IBARRA, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)
16
                     EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT
      BY MR. PEASE:
17
18
      Q. Good morning, Mr. Ibarra.
19
      A. Good morning.
20
          Can you tell the Court, how do you know the defendant,
21
      Julio Sotomayor?
22
      A. Julio is my dad, sir.
23
          And when you say he's your dad, when did you first meet him?
24
          I met him when I was three. I was adopted by my mom in
25
      Ecuador after I was abandoned on February 23rd or 24th.
```

1 date is still unsure. My dad dated my mom when I turned three, and that's when I first met him, and he's been in my life ever 2 3 since. So I call him Dad. THE COURT: As I understand it, sir, you're not the 4 5 biological child of either your mother or your father, but you 6 consider them your mother and father? 7 THE WITNESS: That is correct, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: And you're the young person that, as you 9 say, was abandoned in a foreign country. I think the record 10 will reflect that that's how your mother found you, under 11 something or other, and that she took you without even knowing 12 you at all? THE WITNESS: Yes. I went to -- one of her friends had 13 14 a clinic, so just to check up to see if my health was okay, and 15 then they started filing the adoption paperwork. 16 THE COURT: So as far as you're concerned, 17 Mr. Sotomayor is your father? 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: Right. Thank you. 20 BY MR. PEASE: 21 Q. And how old are you? 22 Α. I am 30. 23 Q. Do you attend college? 24 I am currently finishing up my last semester to graduate 25 with a bachelor's in business, yes.

1 Q. Can you describe for us your relationship with your father? 2 My relationship with my dad is really good. We didn't have 3 the father-son bonding experience when I was younger because of his deployments, but recently we have taken that up, ever since 4 5 he has retired and has been able to be home more. He's been an 6 admiration of mine. I kind of aspire to be like him in the 7 future. He's taught me almost everything that I know, and has 8 given me most of my hobbies as well. 9 Q. Can you give the Court an example or two how your father has 10 supported you through some difficult circumstances? 11 A. Oh, definitely. A few years back I had a bit of a mental 12 breakdown, and had a bit of a suicidal episode as well. I left 13 the house, kind of roamed around trying to figure out myself. 14 My dad took me back in after I had failed, and he kind of put aside all the anger and worry and fear that he had during those 15 16 moments to build me back up to what I should be at that moment. 17 He's taken me under his wing, kind of propelled me to 18 find better jobs, go back to college, finish up, find out what I 19 actually want to do in this world. He's kind of been my 20 backbone these past couple of years to kind of get me back on 21 track. 22 Q. Have there been any other members or friends of yours who 23 your father has served as a mentor or father figure for? A. Oh, there's a long list, yes. So we have a bunch of family 24 25 members who are from single mothers, we have a whole bunch of

- 1 family members whose fathers have died, and my dad has kind of
- 2 taken up the role as their father figure as well, to guide them
- 3 in whatever necessary -- in whatever way necessary.
- 4 Q. Can you talk about a couple of them for us?
- 5 A. Yeah. The one that clearest comes to mind would be my best
- friend from high school. He lost his father when he was, I
- 7 believe, 13, and ever since my dad has been in his life, he's
- 8 kind of looked at him as a father figure. He's helped advise
- 9 him in college deals, personal deals, issues with, you know, the
- 10 loss and all that.
- And any time that he comes over to the house, it's
- 12 always kind of like a relationship like I have with my dad as
- well; he's kind of become his father figure and his father,
- 14 really.
- 15 | O. Are there other friends or family members who have lost
- 16 | their fathers, who have received financial or other support from
- 17 your dad?
- 18 A. Yes. My cousin's stepdad, he died a couple of months ago,
- and at the moment we found out, my dad kind of decided that he
- 20 | would take it upon himself to help in whatever way possible.
- 21 He's been there calling them, making sure they're okay, making
- 22 | sure they're healthy, that they're able to feed themselves, able
- 23 to clothe themselves, whatever necessary. He's kind of been
- 24 that role for them.
- 25 Q. Are there any family friends who your dad has paid their

1 | college tuition for?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

24

25

A. Oh, yes. We have a family friend who went to do university in Australia. She decided that -- well, her father died right before it happened. She chose her major, and my dad decided that he was going to be the one that would help her family out, because her mom was going through a hard time after being a widow and having to take care of all the, like, house stuff and

So he decided that he was going to help her out in whatever way possible so that she could become something, because she was a very -- she has a lot of potential, and he saw that in her.

Q. And what were some of the ways he helped her?

all of the end-of-life things for them.

- A. He's been the one that's helped her pay for the tuition for college. And also, if anything was necessary for her, like advice or whatever, he would be there to call her no matter what
- 17 time of day it was. Because she lives in Australia, so because
- 18 of the time zones.
- Q. Are there family members of yours who live in Ecuador who receive support from your father?
  - A. Most of my family, yes. Especially my uncle, who also has fallen on hard times recently, and my dad has been the one who has made sure that he is fed, he is clothed, all of his medical issues can be addressed, that he has a roof over his head, running water, all the stuff necessary until he's able to get

- back on his feet. And he's been doing that for a couple of
  years, just trying to help him out so they're good.
- Q. During the course of your lifetime, has your father been away on extended military deployments?
- 5 A. Multiple times, yes.
- Q. Can you talk about, briefly, the sacrifices that your family
- 7 has made to support his military career?
- 8 A. Yes, definitely. I mean, the mere fact of not having my dad
- 9 presently there was something that we had to get used to. He
- 10 was always very straightforward with us about what our role as a
- 11 military family was going to be, that he was going to be away.
- But even though he was miles and miles away, on the other side
- of the world, he always made sure that he would be in contact
- 14 | with us, making sure that we're good, that our -- that my
- 15 | schooling was done, that my stepsister's schooling was good,
- 16 | that we're taking care of the house, that we're healthy, that
- 17 | we're fine. Just kind of keeping us updated so we wouldn't
- 18 | worry about him. So he made himself kind of present, even
- 19 though physically he wasn't there for us.
- 20 Q. Is your mother experiencing some medical issues that your
- 21 father helps her with?
- 22 A. Yes. Over the past couple of years my mom has had issues
- with her back and with arthritis, and some, like, nerve issues.
- 24 And my dad has been, like, her primary caretaker. He's the one
- 25 | that has, you know, taken her to the hospital, waited by her

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

side during surgeries, gone to every single doctor's visit. Every time she needs medicine, every time she's had night pains or whatever, he's been the one that's help her to soothe. She gets cramps at night, so he wakes up, helps her deal with those, makes sure that she's okay, makes sure that she's eating well, taking all the medicines, everything that needs to be done. He's been kind of like her base of support during this whole entire medical issue. What would you say are your dad's greatest qualities? Ο. Well, his greatest qualities are his generosity, his humility, his kind of selflessness. He has no issue putting himself to the side, and needs, in order to help anybody else. If anybody, even unknown people, come to him asking for advice or anything, he will happily give it to you. He has no worries, no qualms, no restrictions when it comes to that. doesn't hesitate to help whoever needs help. Is there anything else that you would like the Court to

consider in deciding what a fair sentence would be in this case?

A. I mean, over this past year, I've seen how this has affected my dad, and I've seen how he's kind of been mentally and physically drained. He's emotionally drained, even though he still puts a smily face trying to make everybody not as worried or concerned.

But he has been such a rock for our family and such a foundational pillar for the whole entire family, both his and my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
mom's, that we really need him in the house. My mom especially
needs him with us. And I would really ask the Court to consider
that, and consider keeping him in our lives as long as we
possibly can.
         MR. PEASE: Thank you, Your Honor. I have no other
questions.
         THE COURT: Any questions from the government?
         MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Sir, from the record I can see that your
father served our country well for a good long time, almost
three decades; was able to overcome a lot of odds, being a
person that was not born in the United States. He studied hard,
went to school, served our country well, received a lot of
distinguished service medals, and was basically a pillar of the
United States military.
         But has he discussed with you what has caused him to be
before this court?
         THE WITNESS: He has given me, like, a brief overview
of what happened here.
         THE COURT: Well, essentially, and the government has
suggested, and your father has pled quilty to basically a scheme
involving bribery; in other words, trying to get an advantage by
paying another person to do something for his financial
advantage.
         Is that consistent with the man that you know?
```

```
1
               THE WITNESS: Absolutely not.
 2
               THE COURT: Was there anything that you were aware of
 3
      that would cause a person who has been a pillar of the community
      to allow himself to be corrupted so much?
 4
 5
               THE WITNESS: My dad is very generous, but also very
 6
      trusting of people that he holds dear. And if he puts someone
 7
      in high regard based on whatever he's learned from them, he
 8
      tends to trust in them.
 9
               THE COURT: What if I were to suggest to you that in
10
      this instance it wasn't that, but rather he was facilitating a
11
      scheme where he used a straw person to accomplish something
12
      illegal and corrupt?
13
               THE WITNESS: That wouldn't be my dad. Nothing of what
14
      I've ever known of him would ever point me to think that he
15
      would be capable of doing something like that.
16
               THE COURT: Any questions as a result of the Court's
17
      questions?
18
               MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor.
19
               MR. PEASE: No other questions, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may step down.
21
               Next witness.
22
               MR. PEASE: Maria Ibarra.
23
               THE COURT: Come on up, ma'am.
24
                (Oath administered by courtroom deputy clerk.)
25
               THE COURT: If you could sit down, you need to speak
```

```
close to the mic so we can hear you.
```

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

## (MARIA IBARRA, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

## EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

## BY MR. PEASE:

1

3

4

5

- Q. Good morning, Ms. Ibarra. How do you know the defendant,
- 7 Mr. Julio Sotomayor?
- 8 A. I met him in Ecuador through friends, and his charisma and
- 9 humanity and generosity make me put potential on him and talk to
- 10 | him, and we fell in love. And we had a relationship, and he
- 11 gave me his share, his wings, to fly together in this new
- 12 experience of a new country, helping me raise my son.
- So he has not hesitate on advising and helping and
- 14 | supporting me in all this journey.
- Q. When you first met Mr. Sotomayor, you were -- he was on a
- deployment to Ecuador. Is that correct?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. And eventually you married?
- 19 A. We married. We planned to marry on September 11th. In the
- 20 afternoon of that, we had family members and friends come to
- 21 Alexandria to do a little reception, and Jays had to do
- 22 | something at the Pentagon that morning, and he did went and we
- 23 stayed fixing, you know, the things and trying to do the proper
- 24 things for later.
- 25 And I was having coffee when I saw the TV and all the

```
success that -- all the tragedy that happened that day, as you all know. And I was in shock looking that. I was not even married. I was going to be a widow before getting married. I
```

- didn't know nothing about him. We call and no answer.
- 5 thought that he was dead.
- Q. So your husband was in the Pentagon when the 9/11 plane crashed?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. What happened after that with respect to your wedding?
- 10 A. After, of course, we postpone. There was not groom to do
- 11 | the ceremony. And he appeared like 12, 13 hours later, all
- messed up, and I almost throw myself from the fourth floor,
- 13 Your Honor, to his arms, with happiness and joy that he was
- 14 alive. And with mixed feelings, we were happy to have him, but
- on the other side, we were so sad of looking all this situation,
- 16 | all many friends of him were dead and it was chaos.
- My family from Ecuador were in shock. They didn't know
- 18 how to consolate [sic] over all these hours and to help Jace.
- We went to bed, and then Jace, at 6:00 in the morning, he was
- 20 ready with his gear and his combat suit --
- 21 THE COURT: If I can interrupt you. When you say Jace,
- is that a nickname that you use for Mr. Sotomayor?
- THE WITNESS: He's my osito, but Jace is a military
- 24 nickname that they put.
- 25 THE COURT: Just making sure the record is clear.

- 1 A. So he was ready to go, to help and to deploy or whatever
- 2 other orders he was going to have, and he promised that he would
- 3 return.
- 4 Q. Were you eventually married?
- 5 A. We married. Yes, we married. He keeps his word and we
- 6 married. And then he was deployed to Afghanistan and to that
- 7 region to help fight the terrorists.
- 8 Q. Can you describe to the Court some of the ways Jace has been
- 9 a father to your son?
- 10 A. He has been a wonderful father for my son, for his two
- 11 daughters from his previous marriage. He has been responsible,
- 12 a mentor. He has even taught me the things that I need to know
- 13 to live in this American world. He has been responsible,
- 14 | caring, protective, advising, all three, with no exception and
- 15 difference.
- 16 Q. Can you give the Court an example or two of how your husband
- 17 | has helped others besides just you and your son?
- 18 A. Well, Jace has an invaluable range of different aspect of
- 19 his personality. He has responsibility, friendly, gentleman,
- 20 | combined with his generosity of helping the people in need.
- I have seen with my family, with his family in
- 22 different occasions and relatives and other friends that need
- 23 | support, guide, advice. So he has helped in many ways. Even
- financially, he never hesitate to help others in need. He has a
- 25 | big heart.

- Q. Can you give us an example of that?
- 2 A. Example, like my brother that's a lawyer also in Ecuador, he
- 3 was struggling in situations due to the political situation
- 4 there. So my husband has helped him and the family to get
- 5 together again in all circumstances, in his illness, feeding the
- family, guiding him so he can stand again.
- 7 Q. Did your father's brother die in a tragic accident a few
- 8 | years ago? Did Jace' brother die in an accident a few years
- 9 ago?

- 10 A. Yes, sir. Jace' little brother, which he was a Marine, died
- in a tragic accident. He was killed by a car, and it was a
- 12 hit-and-run. So Julio was devastated by that. It was
- 13 | everything for him. He put to one side his pain and discomfort
- 14 and suffer, and he stand to honor his brother and to help his
- 15 | widow and their siblings, and his mother, that is an older
- 16 | woman, and give him all the honors that he as a military can
- 17 | give to another military Marine that have served his nation.
- It was wonderful to see all the respect that all the
- 19 people in the community of him, in Virginia, came to shake Jace'
- 20 hands to say how much his brother appreciate him and how much
- 21 they, those two brothers Sotomayor, have helped the community
- 22 and the nation.
- Q. Do you rely on Jace for financial and other support?
- 24 A. I do.
- 25 Q. Can you tell us how?

- 1 A. He's so responsible. He has helped me in all the issues
- 2 that I have, struggling, my medical situation. He has never
- 3 hesitate to help me and support me and help even my son that was
- 4 in difficult moments. He has always, always been so responsible
- 5 for us.
- 6 Q. Can you describe briefly for the Court how the observations
- 7 you have made about how this case has had an impact on
- 8 Mr. Sotomayor, and how it's changed him?
- 9 A. It has been very sad for me to see him, how he has feel
- 10 | waste. He's always proud his honors that he has had to serve
- 11 | this nation. He has become more humble and his health has
- deteriorate. His emotionally, physically have been -- he has
- been struggling with that. And even with that situation, he has
- 14 | put his mind in the family to be the backbone of us, and don't
- 15 let us down, and be there for us always.
- He was supporting our daughter that just had a baby,
- 17 unconditionally. She had a very bad and difficult pregnancy, so
- 18 he has been present for him -- for her.
- And it's an honor to be by his side, honestly. I mean,
- 20 | he's everything for me. He means the world for us, for my
- 21 | family. Back in Ecuador, he's very respect and honor. And
- 22 that's my family and friends, but all over the world he has
- 23 touched the heart and the mind of many people.
- 24 Q. Is there anything else you would ask the Court to consider
- 25 in deciding on a fair sentence in this case?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
A. My Honor, it is implausible for us. He's everything.
a role model for us, for the people that we surround, and I beg
you to consider him like to be around us for many years. His
unconditional love, patience, and quide is needed in our home.
         MR. PEASE: Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Any questions from counsel?
         MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may step down.
         Any other witnesses, counsel?
         MR. PEASE: No, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: I'll hear argument from the government
first, and then I'll hear argument from the defense, and then
we'll give Mr. Sotomayor, if he wants to, an opportunity to
allocute.
         MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, just to be clear, do you
want to address the objections to the PSR first?
         THE COURT: Let's do that. Let's do the Ms. Sturgis
issue first. Let's work our way through that.
         MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.
government and the probation office agree that Ms. Sturgis held
a sensitive position and was a high level decisionmaker. Both
factors apply here, but, just to be clear, legally, it's
mutually exclusive. The Court doesn't need to find that both
factors apply.
```

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Do you believe that

the determination with regard to her status which was made in other cases is any way res judicata or collateral estoppel to what I need to do here?

MR. SULLIVAN: I do not, Your Honor. But I think it is certainly persuasive. On two separate occasions, one in which she admitted it herself, she acknowledged that she was a high level decisionmaker and held a sensitive position. And I think it's supported by the evidence.

One of the things that jumped out to me with the voluminous set of exhibits is that emails actually reflect that she was a key person in the scheme.

THE COURT: Was she the final decisionmaker?

MR. SULLIVAN: As far as funding, yes. Yes.

THE COURT: It's been suggested by -- and again, this is give and take. I apologize if you have a little outline that you want to work from, but I like to ask questions to sort of get perspective to let you have the opportunity to sort of see what I'm thinking about.

It's been suggested by your opponent colleague that she was a mid-level manager and needed authorization for anything that she did. And it's also been suggested that the determinations that were made in the other cases related more specifically to her conduct, and may well have forced the Court to make the determination that it did with regard to her level of involvement and her level of responsibility.

MR. SULLIVAN: So as far as the latter point that the Court just raised, I would disagree with that characterization by defense counsel. So Ms. Sturgis was involved in the first bribery scheme that she pled guilty to related to Company B and was related to the contract that brings us here today.

There is another vendor, another scheme that she also pled guilty to, but with both matters and the third scheme that brings us here today, in all of these matters she was a contracting officer, a contract specialist; most importantly, she had an unlimited contract warrant, which means she had the ability to obligate the government to contracts of unlimited value. She had very limited oversight. The reason why she was targeted is because she held a key position within the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Counsel has made the point that she did understand the technical aspects of the U.S. Air Force contract. Even if that's correct, that's not why he selected her for the bribery scheme. He selected her because she is the person that controlled the purse strings. Every contract order, every modification, every significant decision that had to be processed through the Broadcasting Board of Governors, she made, with the exception of one thing. There was one military interdepartmental purchase request that she had to run upstairs to her boss and have the boss sign. But she was the one who facilitated that.

THE COURT: Other than the cases specifically involving Ms. Sturgis, are there any Fourth Circuit opinions that you believe analytically support your perspective in the case?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. We cited Rebrook, we cited Conrad, we cited a number of cases in our brief that we think are 
Matzkin was a naval engineer - that we do think are on point.

In those situations, what the Court, particularly when focusing on sensitive position, looked at with contracting officers and individuals like that is, do they control the purse strings; do their decisions affect the public fisc.

She's in a sensitive position because she has an unlimited warrant. She awarded over \$30 million to Company B through this contract vehicle with the Broadcasting Board of Governors. She had substantive responsibilities within the Broadcasting Board of Governors, she had very limited oversight, she had a great deal of autonomy. The reason why she was selected for the bribery scheme is precisely because of that, because she could keep the gravy train moving, keep the conveyor belt moving with limited oversight and with no one meddling. That's why the defendant selected her.

THE COURT: With regard to the determination that the Court needs to make, I'm assuming that you agree that the government bears the burden of persuasion. But by what quantum of proof?

MR. SULLIVAN: For sentencing, I think it would be a

```
1
      preponderance level, Your Honor.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 3
               MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you.
               MR. PEASE: Your Honor, the facts in this case are very
 4
 5
      clear, and we've provided the Court with extensive evidence to
 6
      support them. Diane Sturgis -- this is kind of a unique
 7
      situation. Diane Sturgis worked for the Broadcasting Board of
 8
      Governors, which is a component of the Department of State. The
 9
      U.S. Air Force funded these contracts, controlled these
10
      contracts, made all decisions relating to these contracts.
11
      There was a blanket purchase agreement vehicle in place already
12
      between BBG and Company B, and that was the vehicle that was
13
      used for the Air Force to be able to have these services
14
      provided.
```

The decisionmakers in this case were the

United States Air Force and its contracting officer's technical representative. The evidence is very clear. Diane Sturgis had no authority whatsoever on any key decision. She made no decision about --

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The comment by your opponent colleague, Mr. Sullivan, is that Ms. Sturgis, as he said, controlled the purse strings.

MR. PEASE: She did not control any purse strings,

Your Honor. There were no decisions -- those purse strings were
controlled by the United States Air Force. These contracts were

funded by the United States Air Force. The United States
Air Force decided what the work would be, what the project and
scope of work would look like. The United States Air Force
managed and oversaw and supervised the work.

The emails are very clear. Diane Sturgis was responsible to ensure all the necessary paperwork to process — that the invoices that came through got to the right place, and when there were contract modifications, it was her responsibility to pass them forward. The CFO of BBG is the one who made decisions about the approval and keeping the process moving.

She had no decision-making authority at all. She literally served as a scrivener, or as a clerk. She made no decisions about the amount of the funding, she made no decisions about the substance or scope of the work, she had no supervision at all over the actual work itself that was being performed on behalf of the Air Force. She didn't supervise Company B or any of the work that Company B was doing, which isn't surprising, because she didn't have the background. These are highly classified intelligence programs that the Air Force involved very specialized work, of which --

THE COURT: What I believe Mr. Sullivan would suggest is that while she made not have had the technical expertise to essentially manage the contract, she was the one who was controlling the money.

MR. PEASE: She didn't control any money, Your Honor.

No payments or invoices were approved in this case until the

Air Force signed off on them. Okay? She was -- she ultimately

had to put her signature on numerous documents. There's no

question about that. But she had no discretion, she had no

authority to say no. If the paperwork was in order, and that

was one of the things that Mr. Sotomayor would help with, and

met with the United States Air Force's requirements, then it was

approved and she signed it and moved things forward.

What are some of the things that she did? She signed contract mods only after they were initiated and approved by the United States Air Force. She admitted in her interviews, in the discovery materials, which we made an exhibit, she had no control over contract modifications. She signed invoices only after the Air Force representative validated and accepted the work for every invoice period. She signed military interdepartmental purchase requests only after the CFO of BBG signed off on them.

THE COURT: Counsel, I know you're being very thorough, and I'm going to ask you a question. If you don't know the answer, I appreciate that. I'm sure you looked at the cases that were cited by Mr. Sullivan, particularly the cases specifically involving Ms. Sturgis. What do you believe were the drivers in those cases which made her qualify under the standard that you now not want her to qualify under?

```
1
               MR. PEASE: You're referring to the cases in which she
 2
      pled guilty?
 3
               THE COURT: Yes.
               MR. PEASE: In those two cases, what happened is, those
 4
 5
      contractors put her daughter on the payroll. She had -- she was
 6
      directly involved in that. She had those contractors put her
 7
      daughter on the payroll to do little or no work at all, and her
 8
      daughter got paid.
 9
               THE COURT: What is the difference between that and the
10
      straw persons that are alleged to have been used in these cases?
11
               MR. PEASE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question.
12
               THE COURT: What is the difference between her daughter
13
      being used in those cases and the straw persons being used in
14
      this cases, as suggested by the government.
15
               MR. PEASE: Well, in both cases there was an improper
16
      financial benefit that she received. There's no question about
17
      that. But the fact that she was willing to accept that
18
      enhancement without challenging it, it has no persuasive
19
      authority here.
20
               If you look -- you need to look at the specific facts
21
      and circumstances on this particular case and in this particular
22
      contract. We're not talking about a situation where it was her
23
      daughter being put on the payroll. These are contracts
24
      involving services provided by a contractor to the Air Force,
```

where her only role is to move paperwork forward.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
In fact, if you look at some of the emails - in fact
Exhibit 27 is one of the most, I think, significant documents.
If you look at it, the Air Force raised a question about whether
she actually even existed. If you look at that email, it says,
"It's nice to know she exists sometimes. Maybe she would return
a phone call sometimes."
         So yes, was she important to the process? Of course.
She or someone else in her position, someone had to sign off on
this paperwork because it was her agency administering the
contract. There's no dispute about that. But this work was not
being done for her agency. She wasn't managing it, supervising
it. She had nothing to do with it, other than to make sure the
right paperwork got to the right people, and that the invoices,
once the Air Force approved them, got paid. That is not --
         THE COURT: I'm going to ask you the same question that
I asked Mr. Sullivan. You would agree that the burden of
persuasion is with the government with regard to this particular
issue?
         MR. PEASE: It most certainly is, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: And you would also agree that the standard
is by a preponderance of the evidence?
         MR. PEASE: I would.
         THE COURT:
                    Thank you, sir.
```

which is a Fourth Circuit unpublished decision, it's compelling.

MR. PEASE: If I may, Your Honor, just the Weston case,

In that case we had a naval public works official with contracting authority, more authority than Diane Sturgis had, and more directly involved in these contracts, and the Court found it wasn't enough. And it relied on the *Stephenson* case, which is the Second Circuit case, which is compelling.

I think if you look at those cases, Your Honor, and if you examine the specific facts here -- I'm not saying

Diane Sturgis could never be a high level decisionmaker or could never be someone in a sensitive position, but in this particular case --

THE COURT: But you're suggesting that in this case it's fact generated; in other words, the specific and particular facts related to this case do not allow her to qualify as that particular individual in this particular case.

MR. PEASE: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think I understand your argument. What the Court is going to do is take the matter under advisement in the sentencing disposition. So now we can switch to sentencing.

The concern that I have, Mr. Sullivan - and I'm sure that you share this concern with regard to Mr. Sotomayor - is that there's some balance that we need to strike here.

Obviously this gentleman has served our country very well for several years, and has been a person who is almost an American success story when it comes to it; coming from a foreign country, managing to make his way up through the educational

ranks, graduating from college, serving our nation with authority. And then sort of gets caught up in some scheme where it's absolutely corrupt.

And has managed to generate a very good largesse for his family. I think I read somewhere that he had an over \$3 million net worth. And it's just concerning, because from my perspective, one could suggest that this is just a person who, for whatever reason, has become greedy; managed to accumulate \$3 million in wealth, able to do a lot of things that people dream about being able to do to help his family and others, and engaged himself in something that is just pathetic, quite frankly.

MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, we would concur and recognize -- so the defendant has had a distinguished military career, and nobody is here to say otherwise. We recognize it, we appreciate the service. But you can't have it both ways. If his military service was completely divorced from the corruption and bribery schemes that we're talking about here today, then it might be a different argument. But it's not. They're intertwined.

He left the service around 2010. He immediately opened up consulting companies and he traded on his contacts and relationships with these same individuals that he had been working with for years in the U.S. Air Force, in the Pentagon in Arlington.

You can't wrap yourself in the same flag that you dishonored. He acted without integrity, he was dishonest in running -- and it's not just this one scheme. As you can see from the other relevant contract, it's other schemes. Every contract that he touched was tainted by either corruption, fraud, or both.

We pointed this out to defense counsel pre-indictment. I've done a number of these procurement fraud cases, and, candidly, I was taken aback by their position when they recommended probation, because this is one of the worst procurement fraudsters that I've had before the Court for sentencing.

We believe that the request for probation is both inappropriate and unjustified. He greased the skids to get nearly all of his corrupt military contracts. He constantly looked to take shortcuts, and we respectfully submit that he's now trying to take additional shortcuts to get out of prison time.

The fact that he has prepaid his financial penalties is commendable. It is also commendable that after indictment and after we provided extensive discovery, that he eventually accepted responsibility for his crime. However, the fact that the defendant can afford to pay a substantial amount of financial penalties up front, and may be doing so, candidly, with the spoils of his criminal activity, should not allow him

to buy his way into a noncustodial sentence. Otherwise, this will truly be a situation where crime does pay.

We respectfully ask the Court to send a strong deterrent message and imprison him for 37 months.

Your Honor, I'm happy to go through the 3553(a) factors, but if the Court has specific questions, I'll streamline it. What I would like to note, though, is, we gave a lot of thought to our recommendation of 37 months. We thought about the 3553(a) factors, the sentencing guidelines, the totality of the circumstances.

Importantly, our recommendation tried to take into account the significant benefits that we've already afforded to the defendant post-indictment. There's no need to give an additional variance or departure here. Why? We agreed to structure the plea around Count I, the conspiracy count, which capped his liability at 60 months. We used a loss amount that was focused on the bribe payments, \$150,000 given to

Ms. Sturgis. One dollar more, by the way, and it would have been 10 levels instead of 8 levels.

We agreed to compromise on restitution and forfeiture because he expressed a willingness to pay those financial penalties up front. We agreed not to seek a fine. We have requested a guideline change due to a sealed filing. We ask the Court now to grant the motion that we filed under seal. And we have recommended the low end of the guideline range. 37 months

should be the floor, not the starting point to vary downward.

Your Honor, we address his age and health-related issues in our brief. If the Court has questions, we can follow up there. Just simply put, he has a number of conditions that are relatively normal for a man of his age, and there's no indication that the Bureau of Prisons cannot address those. He would likely be a Care Level 1 inmate if he were sentenced to prison.

Counsel has brought up continuously in our plea negotiations that there was contract performance here. And that is irrelevant, as we noted in our brief. The fact that there was contract performance doesn't avoid the critical point, which is, the contract would not have been awarded in the first instance but for the fraud and corruption. So this is void ab initio on the civil side, void from inception. It never would have been granted, it would not have been sole sourced to Company B but for the fact that the bribery scheme occurred.

Lastly, there's a discussion in our brief about downward variances based on sentencing disparities with Sturgis. Her second sentence was 30 months, her first sentence was 24 months. They ran concurrently, so essentially a 30-month sentence. Those were smaller bribe schemes. We were not quite there yet on discovery in the scheme involving Sotomayor. She was the one that brought it to our full attention. She did cooperate and she did provide substantial assistance in those

matters.

Counsel has also brought up the fact that one of her schemes involved a different vendor, two other co-conspirators that were related to the other vendor. Very different facts and circumstances, including one individual who was a cooperator in that case, so they were sentenced to a term of imprisonment, but it was below what the government recommended.

Your Honor, just to wrap up, we respectfully submit that this is not a probation case, and it's not a probation case by a long shot. Again, this is one of the more egregious procurement fraud matters that I've been involved with. His sentence should reflect the seriousness of his conduct. Respectfully, we ask for 37 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Well presented.

MR. PEASE: Your Honor, there is one other objection to the presentence investigation report that we had noted. The government and the defense agreed on this one. And that is that the \$150,000 agreed to in the plea agreement should be used to increase the guidelines by eight rather than the 12, which --

THE COURT: Do you concur, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.

MR. PEASE: Your Honor, we certainly agree, there's no doubt this is very serious, very egregious case. It's a case which I've struggled to understand, given the defendant's

background and his history in this case. The sentencing of any individual, and particularly this individual, takes into account more than the offense conduct itself. There are many other factors that are important here for the Court to consider.

The first starting point, certainly, is acceptance of responsibility and remorse and shame. And you'll hear from my client more on those subjects. He is a 65-year-old man, a service-disabled veteran, with not just an impressive 30-year career in the military, it's an extraordinary military career, one where a life devoted to service, where he literally has been flying planes while being shot at. He put his life on the line.

He's been deployed to a dozen countries around the world to fight terrorists --

THE COURT: Which arguably makes his case more problematic and troubling. I'm trying to work my way through how a person who could serve in such a distinguished manner could just get himself involved in a multilevel bribery and corruption scheme. It's almost inconsistent with the values that he would have as a military officer.

MR. PEASE: Right. I'm highlighting and relating to the military service, Your Honor, because we have a motion for a downward departure based on military service under 5H1.11. I've read every federal District Court and appellate court decision that addresses this issue; there is not a case anywhere in America where the facts are stronger than this case that would

support a downward departure based on military service. The Supreme Court, the sentencing guidelines, and many courts have found that military service is a factor that the Court should consider very seriously, and it's a basis for a downward departure.

So in addition to the cooperation departure motion the government has filed, we also ask the Court to depart downward under 5H1.11, based on a truly extraordinary record.

And I'm sure Your Honor has read our submission, and we attached many documents relating to his military career. I mean, this man was responsible for completely reconfiguring the B-52 bomber - that's one of the defining legacies of his career - which has been used by the Air Force in Operation Desert Storm and the global war on terror.

He didn't sit behind a desk, he put his life on the line. And, as a result of that, he has debilitating permanent injuries. Which Mr. Sullivan may pass them off as common to a 65-year-old; there's nothing common about this 65-year-old man. 3,000 hours in a B-52, a bomber pilot flying while being shot, landing on runways in Afghanistan, jumping off the plane onto the tarmac while the plane goes and backs and takes off at night.

I could talk for hours about the service this individual has paid to our nation. It's a nation he embraced as an immigrant. And, as you mentioned, put himself through

college, was not under the best of family circumstances, and made a career not just of serving our country, but of leading our country.

And these performance reports and the numerous medals, including the Legion of Merit --

THE COURT: Which is the highest level of service medal that he can get with his rank. I'm aware of that.

MR. PEASE: So, Your Honor, I want to talk about the point you raised, because I've struggled with it as well. And I understand the Court's position. But I guess what I'm trying to say is, the military service record, it's significant, it justifies a downward departure in addition to a variance.

His health is very serious. I mean, he is in constant pain; his legs, his back condition. He had a heart attack in 2019. His heart condition has worsened, his blood pressure medication has been increased. He's at the risk -- five times greater risk of stroke. He just had a colonoscopy last week where they removed a polyp from his colon. His father died of colon cancer. They're waiting the results of a biopsy on that to see if he has colon cancer.

So his health conditions are extremely serious, and all through this he's been helping to support his family and his wife, who has also serious medical conditions.

But does he get it? You're going to hear from him in a few minutes. Mr. Sotomayor gets it. He made a horrific

mistake. He has been ostracized by the military community which he made a life serving. He is a pariah in that community. His reputation has been destroyed, completely tarnished. He is ashamed of himself and he has let down his family and everyone else who knows him.

No matter what sentence the Court imposes, the indignity and the shame from the mistakes he made when he left the military are something he will have to live with the rest of his life, something that he thinks about every day. And the family that he was a part of for 30 years is gone. It has disappeared and it will never come back to him.

He is someone who has taken responsibility his entire life for helping his family, but not just his immediate family, extended family. You heard from his son who talked about a few examples. He was a little bit nervous when he was testifying. There's a lot more he could have said. But this man has taken everyone he possibly can under his wing during his entire life. He has supported people, even strangers, and provided them with financial support whenever possible, not just when he got out of the Air Force, when he had more money, but when he was in the Air Force.

He not only served his country, he deployed to Japan when there was a tsunami. He deployed to New Orleans for Katrina. He was the first there. He led the U.S. response efforts in imagery and satellite imaging to help first

responders on the ground.

Every time there has been a crisis, he has been the first out the door. And those performance reports speak volumes that the generals who know him, who have commented on his service, talk about him. He put his life at risk for 30 years, put himself above everyone else -- put everyone else above himself. He is an extraordinary man. He lost his way. He left the military after a lifetime of being in government service, and certainly wanted to make a living, and he went about it, obviously, the wrong way.

I don't agree with Mr. Sullivan that these contracts wouldn't have been awarded but for him paying Diane Sturgis.

The contract had been awarded. The payments came later. So it doesn't change the fact that what he did was wrong and shameful, and I'm not in any way excusing it.

And certainly it's no defense that Company B, under his guidance and with his help, performed, not just did the work they were paid to do, but did it exceptionally. The government got much more than what it paid for. Again, it's not an excuse. It doesn't change what he did, it doesn't make it right. But it's certainly a factor in considering the nature and circumstances of the offense conduct that the Court can and should consider here.

He's a first time offender, 65-year-old man, and 30 percent disabled veteran. Prison is going to be extremely

hard on him physically, emotionally. He has so many serious health issues. Yes, I'm not contesting that the Bureau of Prisons can't -- it would be impossible to take care of those conditions. But prison is going to be much harder and much more difficult for Mr. Sotomayor than it would be for someone else.

THE COURT: The question, and obviously one of the 3553(a) factors that we have to consider - not necessarily the preeminent factor, but a factor - is, how is this going to -- and I'm paraphrasing this. How is this going to be perceived by the public at large?

In other words, we have this distinguished military individual who has served his country well, who is sick, but engaged in a public bribery and corruption scheme, who essentially does not have to pay the price of going to incarceration like most other individuals would have to in a case such as this. How do we find that balance that we must strike?

Again, we're going to give him credit for what he's done. That's easy for me. What's hard for me is the responsibility I have to make sure that the appropriate message has been sent that, notwithstanding what you may have done for this country, you still have to live by the rules. And the rules require that you not engage in a scheme such as this.

MR. PEASE: Understood, Your Honor. Well, there are

two components to the answer to your question. The first, obviously, is specific deterrence. And I submit to you that there is no chance this man is going to be a recidivist. You know, if you look at the sentencing commission statistics we cited, for individuals his age, first time offenders, he will not. He has learned his lesson. He is not going to offend again. He's not going to have the opportunity to. His life is over. His reputation has been destroyed. He is left to try to pick up the pieces.

And the main and most important thing he had besides his family was his reputation, was his standing in the military community. He was a senior decorated officer, not just some individual who served in the military. He was recognized, Congressional medals from Hawaii and Palmetto, the Legion of Merit. He is known around the world. The French ambassador wrote a letter about how he restored French-American cooperation.

There are so many stories of his legacy. Those memories, the sacrifices he made, being deployed dozens of times away from his family, that was his life. That was everything to him. And it's gone. It's been destroyed.

And so when we talk about general deterrence, certainly jail time sends a message. And I cited some of the studies in our brief about white collar offenders. The question is, how harsh does the penalty need to be, and shouldn't we also

consider the impact of the sentence in other ways, and how it impacts the life of individuals.

And in these sorts of cases, there's no evidence to support the idea that more prison time means more deterrence.

If anyone were to look at him, a 65-year-old decorated war hero, combat veteran, serious health issues, in the waning days of his life, okay, with a heart attack, he's at risk of stroke at any moment, and waiting to see if he has cancer, no one would look at him, as disgraced and dishonored as he is, receiving a sentence of probation, home confinement, community service, any other conditions the Court could think of, no one will look at that sentence and say, this man got off easy, he got a break that other people should have gotten.

In fact, if you look at the last exhibit in our binder, Exhibit 48, the sentencing commission has looked at bribery cases, and in 78 percent of them, the Court varied downward and like 58 percent of the sentence was reduced. So it's common in bribery cases to grant downward variances, significant downward variances, for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Sotomayor is much older than the average bribery defendant, his health conditions are far worse, and there's never been a defendant in a federal courtroom in this country with the service record that this man has had facing a case like this.

So I understand completely. I was a federal prosecutor

```
for 16 years, Your Honor, and I stood in Mr. Sullivan's place in bribery and public corruption cases. I've never seen one like this. This case keeps me up at night. I don't have a good explanation for you, other than he lost his way. In his zeal to try to provide support to his family, he crossed the line. He made terrible mistakes, he did things that are criminal, and he fully accepts responsibility for it. He fully accepts it, Your Honor.
```

So I beg you to consider a sentence that will allow him to remain with his family and give him time. He still has much more to contribute to our society, and warehousing him in a federal prison, Your Honor, is not necessary to send a message of general deterrence, I respectfully submit to you.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

Mr. Sotomayor, is there anything you want to say to the Court before the Court imposes sentence in this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. With your permission, I wanted to get it right, so I took some notes. If I could read those.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: And I apologize for my nervousness. I'll try to read.

So, dear sir, I stand before you, head bowed, totally drenched in shame. I'm totally covered in dishonor. I am unable to find words sufficient to express my sorrow or the

profound remorse that I feel.

Approximately 10 years ago I made a series of dreadful mistakes. I failed to think these things through. I failed.

My desire to succeed in my post-retirement business efforts clouded my judgment. I lost my way, despite a lifetime of service and honor that I pursued until that point. It was my decision, no one else's. I offer no excuses. It was my mistake, I own it. I assume full responsibility for my failures, for my actions. They are mine.

I recognize and acknowledge that what I did was more than wrong, it was shameful. And I sincerely apologize to the Court and to those impacted by my actions, to my beloved Air Force, the Broadcast Board of Governors, to my colleagues. As a result, I have caused great pain and hurt to those who are most dear to me.

This is especially true regarding my bride of 25 years. She has done nothing but care, love, and support me throughout my life. She is the rock of my existence. To my son, who I tried to raise as a solid citizen, who looks up to me, I failed him. To my family, my band of brothers, I have failed them. I have failed myself.

I cannot say how much I am sorry, or cry enough - and I have a lot lately - for the hurt that I am the cause of. I'm sorry. (Speaking Spanish.) In Spanish I said, I'm sorry, my love, for the pain I've caused you. Son, forgive me. I say

that to all.

I also failed the nation that I served for 30 years through my actions that have brought me here today before you, sir. My actions have brought dishonor to myself and to my nation, a nation I love and fought for and protected my entire life, and would do so again.

I deeply regret and am ashamed of my actions which corrupted a contracting process, and would do anything possible to change this past and the poor decisions, if I could. But I know I cannot. I only have faith and dedicate myself to improve our future as best I can, with all the abilities the good lord has blessed me with.

At a time in a life when a man should be settling down with his grandma bride, this beautiful lady, we should be cuddled, remembering a life together, over a fire, maybe hot chocolate. Instead, I've caused her unnecessary and inexcusable tears, grief, confusion, and pain. She trusted me. I failed her. I had no right to do this.

I will go to my grave with this taint on my soul. Not a day will go by that I am not aware. I've always strived to leave my children, and now my grandbabies, a clean, honest name, one they could be proud of and carry forward with honor. My mother and father gave me that name with high hopes from a life of their sacrifice. My dad passed away a few years ago; my mom will be 87 this Saturday. She has very few years left in her.

I recognize how I failed them all. I can only pray for a chance to atone to all of them with every day that I have remaining.

My mistakes were and are deeper than I could have imagined, and so much more painful than I realized. I know there are no do-overs, and I accept the consequences of my action. I can only pray and ask the Court for mercy, a last chance to try to make things right, an opportunity to care for them, to be there for them, to help them as I can until my own end.

I faithfully served my nation 30 years without fail, and I can only hope to dedicate my remaining time on earth to serve my family, to care for my bride during these difficult times to come, to love and cherish her even more than I can today; to care for her medical and emotional needs that are degrading; to be able to put a blanket on her at night so she cannot get cold. To comfort her in our sunset years, to be there for our children, to help guide them, see them grow as good parents, help build them, help face them -- help them face the challenges of these difficult times coming.

To be there for my grandbabies, to help them be good, happy kids, be good citizens of our nation, and prove themselves, maybe spoil them a little bit on occasion. Perhaps along the way I can recover the shame and loss of dignity in their eyes.

I thank you, sir. Thank you, Your Honor, for

considering what I have said today and all the circumstances that the Court will take into account in determining a just penalty for my failure and my actions. Please, please know that I sincerely apologize for what I have done, and will continue to do everything possible in an attempt to right the wrongs that I have done. For this has been a once-in-a-lifetime hard error in my judgment that I completely regret. I have learned a great, great deal. I have grown from this experience. I know I'll have much, much more to give. I know I can contribute much to my family and society in this lifetime. I pray for a second chance to provide that, to prove it, to so do it.

With deepest sincerity, I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: I need to ask you one question.

THE DEFENDANT: Sir.

THE COURT: I have to work my way through this, and it's a hard decision. And one of the things that I do is I observe everything that's going on in the courtroom. And I can tell, next to your wife and your son, the person who is most troubled by this is your own counsel. He is just overwhelmed by the circumstance that you're facing, and he has essentially placed himself in your shoes, and the grief that he shares as to what I may do in the context of this case.

But I need to ask this question. As a person who has served our country so well -- and I compliment you on that, and I want to let you know I appreciate that. I come from a

```
military family also. My brother served as a lieutenant colonel in the Army for 30 years; never made colonel. He didn't get the Legion of Merit. He got the one next to the Legion of Merit, and was disappointed that he didn't get the Legion of Merit.
```

My son-in-law was deployed seven times as an F-18 fighter pilot during the many conflicts that we had in the Middle East, and I'm very proud of him. He graduated from -- he served in the United States Navy for a number of years, and now he flies for a commercial airline. Very proud of him.

But the question I have for you, sir, is, you're a bright man, no question about it. So much to offer. What was going through your mind when you knew that you were doing something that was just flat wrong? Not assessing the elements of criminal liability, but I have got to imagine that in your heart you knew it was wrong. Why did you do it?

THE DEFENDANT: I lost my way, sir. I became over-enthused at trying to succeed. I didn't think it through clearly. My fault, like I said. Everything had been organized and done and started, and I got wrapped up in a moment. I didn't think it through. It's a failure, my own.

I lost my way that day in the hopes that I would try to do something better and longer, and it was just flat out wrong.

I failed to consider all the options, something I should have done.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Sotomayor, you may remain seated while the Court imposes sentence. The dispositional aspect of it is pretty long, and I don't want him on his feet for all that time.

All right. In reaching the sentencing disposition in this case, the Court has made the determination, despite the evidence presented by the government, but the Court is going to decline to apply the four-level increase for the involvement of a public official in a high level decision-making or sensitive position under Section 2C1.1B3, because whether Sturgis qualifies as such an official is a relatively close call.

I'm going to grant the defendant's motion for a downward departure and variance due to his distinguished military service, age, health, and family situation, but the sentence the Court is going to impose must send a strong deterrent message to the public that bribery is a serious crime that carries serious consequences.

Under the sentencing guidelines, the base offense level is 12. Because the offense involved more than one bribe or extortion, the offense level is increased by two levels under statute. The Court finds that the probation officer properly found that a 12-level increase is warranted because of the value of the payment, the benefit received or to be received in return for the payment, the value of anything obtained or to be

obtained by a public official or others acting with a public official, or the loss to the government from the offense which is greater exceeded \$250,000. However, the Court takes into consideration that pursuant to the plea agreement, the parties stipulated to an eight-level loss amount.

As indicated earlier, the defendant objects to the probation office's application of a four-level increase for the involvement of a public official. But, as the Court has determined, in this context and the facts presented in this case, that four-level increase would not be appropriate. The sentencing guideline commentary defines a high level decision-making or a sensitive position as, quote, "A position characterized by a direct authority to make decisions for or on behalf of a government, department, agency, or other governmental entity, or by substantial influence over the decision-making process."

According to case law, positions to which the adjustment has been applied have additional hallmarks of authority. These hallmarks include supervisory authority over other employees, the authority to make public policy, the ability to stand in the shoes of a policymaker, or the ability to influence policymakers. A sister jurisdiction, the Fifth Circuit, has also found that the existence of discretion involving final decision-making authority over matters of public policy or over the expenditures of substantial sums of money to

be an important mark of high level responsibility.

Here, Ms. Sturgis does not appear to have had final decision-making authority over the money issued under the guidelines of the contract. Rather, Ms. Sturgis' actions were subject to review and approval, not only by her direct supervisors at the BBG, but also from the United States Air Force. At bottom on Ms. Sturgis' position, the latter has some degree of discretion. It does not set her apart from any other contracting officers who worked for the government.

That was recognized in the Weston case of the Fourth Circuit. According to Weston, it is apparent that any official to whom a gratuity may be offered or given will have some authority, or apparent authority, to make decisions that will affect the public financial circumstances. That fact alone, however, cannot distinguish such an official from a multitude of other personnel in the federal service.

Because defendant has clearly demonstrated responsibility for the offense, the offense level is decreased by two levels under statute. And because defendant has assisted authorities in the investigation and prosecution of his own misconduct by timely notifying authorities of his intention to enter a plea of guilty, once again, the offense level is decreased by one additional level.

Therefore, the defendant's total offense level is 23.

The Court recognizes, however, that the parties stipulated to an

eight-level loss amount, which results in a total offense level of 19. The criminal history score is 0 and the criminal history category is I. Accordingly, the applicable guideline range in this case is 46 to 57 months imprisonment. Again, however, the Court considers that the parties stipulated to an eight-level loss amount, which results in a guideline range of 30 to 37 months imprisonment. The supervised release term under the guidelines is one to three years, the fine range is 25,000 to \$670,000.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3553, the Court should consider the following: One, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; two, the need for the sentence imposed to, among other things, reflect the seriousness of the offense and adequately deter criminal conduct; three, the kinds of sentences available; four, the guidelines; five, policy statements issued by the sentencing commission; six, the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records found guilty of similar conduct; and, finally, the need to provide restitution to the victims of the offense. Ultimately, under the Booker standard, the sentence must meet a standard of reasonableness.

The Court first considers the government's sealed motion pursuant to statutes. For reasons stated in the government's sealed motion, the Court finds that a decrease in

the sentence is appropriate in this case and will grant the sealed motion.

The Court next turns to defendant's motion for downward departure and variance. The Court finds the defendant's case presents several mitigating factors under the specific statute; specifically, his exceptional military service, his age and poor health, and his family circumstances. Accordingly, the Court will grant the defendant's motion and impose a slightly below-sentencing-guidelines sentence.

With respect to the 3553(a) factors, with respect to the history and characteristics of the defendant, the Court has carefully considered defendant's specific circumstances, including his outstanding and commendable military service, his age, his poor health, and his family situation. The Court also recognizes that the defendant has expressed clear remorse and accepted responsibility for his role in the offense.

The Court additionally considers that the defendant has already paid the full amount of restitution to be ordered in this case.

And as for the nature and circumstances of the offense, it is unfortunate that the defendant used his skills and knowledge he acquired through his 30-year military service to defraud the country he once honorably served.

The Court next considers the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote

respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and to provide the defendant with the needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

It has been stated and everyone agrees that bribing a government official is a very serious offense. The defendant's corrupt behavior and payments to Ms. Sturgis in the instant case breached the trust bestowed upon her, and the Court must impose a sentence that is significant enough to convey to the defendant and others that bribery is a serious crime that is not worth the risk.

The guideline range for this case, again, is 46 to 57 months. However, the Court will take into account the parties' stipulation to an eight-level loss amount, which results in a guideline range of 30 to 37 months.

In this instance, the Court's sentence will not create unwarranted sentencing disparities. That is, it is commensurate with sentences received in other cases and involving similar schemes. The defendant's sentence will include court-ordered restitution, which will provide compensation, to some extent, to the government agency that he defrauded. In this court's view, 30 months incarceration to be accomplished by a six-month prison sentence and a home confinement of 24 months accomplishes that

objective.

As indicated, the defendant shall pay \$405,000 in restitution to the Broadcasting Board of Directors, now known as the United States Agency For Global Media. The Court imposes a three-year period of supervised release. During his period of supervision, the defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court, as well as the following special conditions:

Defendant shall apply all monies received from income tax refunds, lottery winnings, inheritances, judgments, and any anticipated or unexpected financial gains to the outstanding court-ordered financial obligation, or in a lesser amount to be determined by the Court upon the recommendation of the probation department.

The defendant shall provide the probation officer access to any requested personal or business related financial information. Defendant shall not open any new lines of credit or bank accounts without the advance approval of the probation office. The defendant shall notify all current and future employers of the offense of conviction, and provide written verification as directed by the probation office.

The defendant shall participate in a program approved by the United States Probation Office for mental health treatment. The cost of this program is to be paid by the defendant as directed by the probation officer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
Even though use of cannabis in the Commonwealth of
Virginia is legal, the defendant shall not use marijuana or
cannabis in any form, unless he receives a doctor's prescription
for the pain that he is suffering from his medical condition.
         The Court will impose a special assessment of $100,
pursuant to statute.
         Counsel, do you have a copy of the notice of right to
appeal sentence under limited circumstances?
         MR. PEASE: I do, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: If you could have your client endorse that
and hand that up to the Court, we'll make that part of the
record.
         I also ask, because of the new disposition set out by
the Fourth Circuit, and I will inquire herein, does the
defendant or his counsel have any objections to the conditions
of probation articulated by the Court?
         MR. PEASE: No, Your Honor.
         May I ask -- I just want to make sure I heard
Your Honor currently. The sentence the Court is imposing is,
did you say six months in prison?
         THE COURT: Six months of actual incarceration,
24 months of home confinement. In other words, it's a 30-month
sentence, but I'm going to allow him to serve 24 months of it in
home confinement.
         Yes, ma'am?
```

```
1
               THE PROBATION OFFICER: Sorry, Your Honor, I just want
 2
      to clarify. The 24 months of home confinement would have to be
 3
      a condition of supervised release.
               THE COURT: Yes, we'll do it that way. What I want you
 4
 5
      to do is formulate it in a way that's consistent with the
 6
      requirements that the probation office needs to do to accomplish
 7
      its objective.
 8
               THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. So it would be a
 9
      six-month imprisonment sentence, and then, as a special
10
      condition of supervised release, it would be 24 months of --
11
               THE COURT: Do you have any objection to that, counsel?
12
               MR. PEASE: No, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Yes, ma'am.
14
               THE PROBATION OFFICER: Thank you, Your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: The Court will enter the document entitled
16
      "Notice of Right to Appeal Sentence Under Limited
17
      Circumstances," and make it part of the record in this matter.
18
               I'll state for the record that the matter was very well
19
      argued both by the government and by counsel for the defense.
20
      Mr. Sotomayor, I struggled with this case a lot, because it's
21
      sad, quite frankly. As a matter of fact, it's a case that I'll
22
      probably share with my family, with our military background, as
23
      to how, as you put it, one can lose their way. But the Court
24
      has taken into consideration a whole lot of things, particularly
25
      your statement, the statement of your counsel, and essentially
```

```
gave you the benefit of the doubt here that you'll never do this again.
```

So, sir, I hope you take full advantage, in a positive way, of the disposition of the Court, and I hope that you're able to put your life back in order to some degree.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

MR. PEASE: Your Honor, if I may, we would ask the Court, respectfully, to recommend to the Bureau of Prisons designation to a facility as close as possible to Alexandria, Virginia.

THE COURT: I can do that. What I would suggest is that you give me one that you want me to recommend, because if I don't have a specific recommendation, the Bureau of Prisons will do whatever they want to do.

I'm assuming you also want to ask for a report date?

MR. PEASE: Yes, Your Honor. I would ask that the

defendant remain on release until he has a report date from the

Bureau of Prisons. I talked to Mr. Sullivan about that; the

government has no objection. He's complied with all the

conditions of his pretrial release.

THE COURT: I'm going to direct that he report no later than January 2nd, 2024. That will get him through the holidays, and might well put him in a position to understand the significance of having time with your family during the holidays, and the loss that he's going to sustain for that next

```
1
      six months by not being home with his family.
 2
               January 2nd, 2024, Mr. Sotomayor. Your counsel will
 3
      discuss with you the means and facility for you to meet your
      obligation in that regard. Understand that failing to appear -
 4
 5
      I'm not suggesting that you would do that - is a violation of
      the requirements of your sentence, and will be dealt with in an
 6
 7
      unfavorable way for you.
 8
               Do you have any questions, sir?
 9
               THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. I shall comply as you say.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Any questions from the
11
      government?
12
               MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor. We do have a couple of
13
      housekeeping matters.
14
               THE COURT: Do you have a couple of motions on the
      Count II and Count III, IV, V, and VI?
15
16
               MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. So we did it as a written motion
17
      to dismiss Counts II through VI. Would the Court prefer us to
18
      put it through the ECF system?
19
               THE COURT: Let's just go ahead and do it now, if you
20
      like.
21
               Any objection to that.
22
               MR. PEASE: Certainly not, Your Honor.
23
               MR. SULLIVAN: And we also have a consent order of
24
      forfeiture signed by the parties, and a restitution order signed
25
      by the parties.
```

1	THE COURT: Which will also be made part of the record.
2	The consent order of forfeiture and the restitution
3	order have been endorsed and made a part of the record in this
4	matter.
5	Anything else we need to do?
6	MR. SULLIVAN: Not from the government.
7	MR. PEASE: No, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Very good.
9	(Off the record at 11:44 a.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
17	
18	I, Rebecca Stonestreet, certify that the foregoing is a
19	correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
20	above-entitled matter.
21	
22	
23	
24	//Rebecca Stonestreet//10/3/23
25	SIGNATURE OF COURT REPORTER DATE
	1